arXiv:1511.04761v1 [math.MG] 15 Nov 2015

INJECTIVE SUBSETS OF $l_\infty(I)$

DOMINIC DESCOMBES AND MAËL PAVÓN

Abstract. We give an explicit characterization of all injective subsets of the model space $l_\infty(I)$ for a general set I, in terms of inequalities involving 1-Lipschitz functions. Since the class of all injective metric spaces coincides with the one of all absolute 1-Lipschitz retracts, the present work yields a characterization of all the subsets of $l_\infty(I)$ that are absolute 1-Lipschitz retracts.

1. Introduction

A metric space (X, d) is said to be *injective* if for every isometric embedding $i\colon A \to B$ of metric spaces $(A, d_A), (B, d_B)$ and every 1-Lipschitz map $f\colon A \to X$, there exists a 1-Lipschitz map $\overline{f}$ such that $f = \overline{f} \circ i$. Basic examples of injective metric spaces include $\mathbb{R}$, the space $l_\infty(I)$ for any set I, as well as $\mathbb{R}$-trees. By $l_\infty(I)$ is meant the space of all real-valued bounded functions f endowed with the norm $\|f\|_\infty := \sup_{i\in I} |f_i|$ which we denote by $\|f\|$ for notational convenience. In the context of subsets of $l_\infty(I)$, we need to introduce some pieces of notation. Let moreover $\widehat{\pi}_i\colon l_\infty(I) \to l_\infty(I\setminus\{i\})$ be the map given by dropping the i-th coordinate.

This work proves a metric characterization of the injective subsets of $l_\infty(I)$ in terms of systems of inequalities given by 1-Lipschitz functions. Namely,

1.1. **Theorem.** *A non-empty subset Q of $l_\infty(I)$ is injective if and only if it can be written as*

$$Q = \{x \in l_\infty(I) : (\underline{r}_i \circ \widehat{\pi}_i) \leq x_i \leq (\overline{r}_i \circ \widehat{\pi}_i) \text{ for all } i \in I\} \tag{1.1}$$

where $\underline{r}_i, \bar{r}_i : l_\infty(I \setminus \{i\}) \to \mathbb{R}$ are 1-Lipschitz maps satisfying $\underline{r}_i \leq \bar{r}_i$, that is $\underline{r}_i(y) \leq \overline{r}_i(y)$ for all $y \in l_\infty(I\setminus\{i\})$, possibly dropping a subcollection of the collection of all inequalities appearing in (1.1).

The characterization is explicit, namely it provides a concrete expression for each single injective subset of each of the model spaces $l_\infty(I)$. The proof of this characterization is based on the proof by the first author of the characterization in the particular case where $I = \{1, \dots, n\}$, that is in the particular case where $l_\infty(I)$ corresponds to $\mathbb{R}^n$ endowed with the maximum norm cf. [3]. In the next section, we prove among others the equivalence between hyperconvexity and the absolute 1-Lipschitz retract property.

2. Preliminaries on Absolute 1-Lipschitz Retracts, Hyperconvexity and Isbell's Injective Hull

Let us start by recalling two characterizations of injective metric spaces. A metric space (X, d) is called an *absolute 1-Lipschitz retract (or 1-ALR)* if for every

Date: December 24, 2015.

isometric embedding $i\colon X \to Y$ into a metric space Y, there exists a 1-Lipschitz retraction of Y onto $i(X)$. To show that this property is equivalent to injectivity, assume first that X is injective. If now $i\colon X \to Y$ is an isometric embedding, $i(X)$ is injective. Thus, the identity map on $i(X)$ extends to a 1-Lipschitz retraction $\varrho\colon Y \to i(X)$ showing that X is a 1-ALR. Conversely, every metric space X embeds isometrically into $l_\infty(X)$ via a Kuratowski embedding $k_{x_0}\colon x \mapsto d_x - d_{x_0}$ for an arbitrarily chosen base point $x_0 \in X$. Hence, if X is a 1-ALR, then $k_{x_0}(X)$ is a 1-Lipschitz retract in $l_\infty(X)$. Therefore, by injectivity of $l_\infty(X)$ it follows that X is injective as well.

Another characterization of injective metric spaces relies upon an intersection property of metric balls. In a metric space (X, d), we use the notation $B(x, r) := \{y \in X : d(x, y) \leq r\}$. One says that (X, d) is *hyperconvex* if every family $\{(x_\gamma, r_\gamma)\}_{\gamma\in\Gamma}$ in $X \times \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $r_\beta + r_\gamma \geq d(x_\beta, x_\gamma)$ for all pairs of indices $\beta, \gamma \in \Gamma$, has the property that $\bigcap_{\gamma\in\Gamma} B(x_\gamma, r_\gamma) \neq \emptyset$. (As a matter of convention, the intersection equals X if $\Gamma = \emptyset$, so that hyperconvex spaces are non-empty by definition.) To see that injectivity implies hyperconvexity, let $\{(x_\gamma, r_\gamma)\}_{\gamma\in\Gamma} \in X \times \mathbb{R}$ be a family with $r_\beta + r_\gamma \geq d(x_\beta, x_\gamma)$ for all $\beta, \gamma \in \Gamma$. Let $A := \{x_\gamma\}_{\gamma\in\Gamma}$ be endowed with the metric d_A induced by (X, d). Set $B := A \cup \{b\}$ where $d_B(x_\gamma, b) := r_\gamma$. By our assumptions, d_B defines a metric on B. By injectivity of X, there is a 1-Lipschitz map $\bar{\jmath}\colon B \to X$ such that the inclusions $j\colon A \to X$ and $i\colon A \to B$ satisfy $\bar{\jmath} \circ i = j$. It follows that $\bar{\jmath}(b) \in \bigcap_{\gamma\in\Gamma} B(x_\gamma, r_\gamma)$, which in turn shows that X is hyperconvex. For the proof of the converse, note that if $f\colon A \to X$ is 1-Lipschitz, $i\colon A \to B$ is an isometric embedding, and $b \in B \setminus i(A)$, then $d_B(i(a), b) + d_B(i(a'), b) \geq d_A(a, a') \geq d(f(a), f(a'))$ for all $a, a' \in A$. Hence, if X is hyperconvex, then $S := \bigcap_{a\in A} B(f(a), d_B(i(a), b))$ is non-empty, and one obtains a 1-Lipschitz map $f_b\colon i(A) \cup \{b\} \to X$ by setting $f_b(i(a)) := f(a)$ on A and taking $f_b(b)$ to be any point in S. Using Zorn's lemma one can prove the existence of a map $\bar{f}$ with the desired properties, from which one deduces that X is injective. A direct consequence of this characterization is that the intersection of any family of closed balls in an injective metric space is itself injective if and only if it is non-empty.

Isbell proved that every metric space (X, d) possesses an *injective hull* (i, Y) (later, when considering Isbell's injective hull $(\mathrm{e}, \mathrm{E}(X))$ we usually write $\mathrm{E}(X)$ for simplicity) which is unique up to isometry and minimal among injective spaces containing an isometric copy of X. This means that $i\colon X \to Y$ is an isometric embedding with the following property: whenever there is a metric space Z and a 1-Lipschitz map $h\colon Y \to Z$ so that $h \circ i$ is an isometric embedding, it follows that h is an isometric embedding as well.

We now need to give a short outline of some elements of Isbell's construction for later use. For a more comprehensive introduction to injective spaces and the construction of $\mathrm{E}(X)$, see for instance [6]. Given a metric space (X, d), we denote by $\mathbb{R}^X$ the vector space of real-valued functions defined on X and we set

$$\Delta(X) := \{f \in \mathbb{R}^X : f(x) + f(y) \geq d(x, y) \text{ for all } x, y \in X\}. \tag{2.1}$$

For $f, g \in \mathbb{R}^X$, the inequality $g \leq f$ means that $g(x) \leq f(x)$ for all x. A function $f \in \Delta(X)$ is called *extremal* if there is no $g \leq f$ in $\Delta(X)$ different from f. One can show that the collection $\mathrm{E}(X)$ of all extremal functions in $\Delta(X)$ is equivalently

given by

$$\mathrm{E}(X) = \big\{ f \in \mathbb{R}^X : f(x) = \sup_{y\in X}(d(x,y) - f(y)) \text{ for all } x \in X \big\}. \tag{2.2}$$

Thus, $f \in \mathrm{E}(X)$ if and only if $f \in \Delta(X)$ and for every $x \in X$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there is an $y \in X$ so that

$$f(x) + f(y) \leq d(x,y) + \varepsilon. \tag{2.3}$$

Applying the equation defining the members of $\mathrm{E}(X)$ twice, we obtain that for $f \in \mathrm{E}(X)$ and for all $x, x' \in X$, one has

$$f(x) - d(x,x') = \sup_{y\in X}(d(x,y) - d(x,x') - f(y)) \leq f(x').$$

This implies that extremal functions are 1-Lipschitz. One can also prove that the map $(f,g) \mapsto \sup_{x\in X} |f(x) - g(x)|$ endows $\mathrm{E}(X)$ with a metric. It follows from (2.1) that every function in $\Delta(X)$ is non-negative. It is easy to see that for each $x \in X$, the function d_x given by the assignement $y \mapsto d(x,y)$ is extremal, and the functions of this form are the only extremal functions with zeros. One can show that $(\mathrm{e}, \mathrm{E}(X))$ is in fact an injective hull of X. Thus, to *every* metric space (X,d) corresponds Isbell's injective hull $(\mathrm{e}, \mathrm{E}(X))$ where $\mathrm{E}(X)$ isometrically embeds into $l_\infty(X)$ via a Kuratowski embedding.

3. The Characterization

3.1. **Theorem** ([2, 4])**.** *If Θ is a totally ordered set and $(H_\theta)_{\theta\in\Theta}$ is a decreasing family of nonempty bounded hyperconvex spaces, then the intersection is hyperconvex.*

Recall that for a metric space (X,d), we write $B(x,r) := \{y \in X : d(x,y) \leq r\}$. A non-empty subset A of a metric space (X,d) is *externally hyperconvex* in X if for any collection $\{(x_\gamma, r_\gamma)\}_{\gamma\in\Gamma} \subset X \times [0,\infty)$ satisfying $d(x_\beta, x_\gamma) \leq r_\beta + r_\gamma$ and $d(x_\gamma, A) \leq r_\gamma$ for all $\beta, \gamma \in \Gamma$, one has $A \cap \bigcap_{\gamma\in\Gamma} B(x_\gamma, r_\gamma) \neq \emptyset$.

3.2. **Lemma.** *Let (X,d) be a metric space and $x_0 \in X$. Then, the following are equivalent*

(i) (X,d) is injective,
(ii) $B(x_0,R)$ is injective for every $R \in [0,\infty)$.

Proof. It is clear that (i) implies (ii) since X is hyperconvex. To prove the other implication, let $\{(x_\gamma, r_\gamma)\}_{\gamma\in\Gamma} \subset X \times [0,\infty)$ be such that $d(x_\beta, x_\gamma) \leq r_\beta + r_\gamma$. Fix $\alpha \in \Gamma$ and for every $\beta, \gamma \in \Gamma$, define

$$\begin{aligned} A_\gamma &:= B(x_\gamma, r_\gamma) \cap B(x_\alpha, r_\alpha), \\ R_{\beta\gamma} &:= \max\{d(x_\alpha, x_\beta), d(x_\alpha, x_\gamma)\} + d(x_\alpha, x_0) + r_\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

One has $x_\beta, x_\gamma \in B(x_0, R_{\beta\gamma})$ and this last set is hyperconvex by assumption, it follows that

(a) $B(x_\alpha, r_\alpha)$ is hyperconvex (since $B(x_\alpha, r_\alpha) \subset B(x_0, R_{\beta\gamma})$),
(b) A_γ is externally hyperconvex in $B(x_\alpha, r_\alpha)$ for each $\gamma \in \Gamma$,
(c) $A_\beta \cap A_\gamma \neq \emptyset$ for every $\beta, \gamma \in I$.

Hence, it follows by [7, Proposition 1.2] that $\bigcap_{\gamma\in\Gamma} B(x_\gamma, r_\gamma) = \bigcap_{\gamma\in\Gamma} A_\gamma \neq \emptyset$. □

For the characterization of Theorem 1.1 to hold, we may (as stated there) need to drop an arbitrary number of the inequalities. In order to treat all cases in a uniform way we do the following. Set $\overline{\mathbb{R}} := \{-\infty\} \cup \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ and endow it with the obvious total order (also, for example $\max\{x, -\infty\} = x$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$). Then we allow the 1-Lipschitz bounds $\underline{r}_i, \bar{r}_i$ to take values in $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$. And a map $l_\infty(I \setminus \{i\}) \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is called 1-*Lipschitz* if it is either constant (allowing the image to be $\{-\infty\}$ or $\{\infty\}$) or it is real valued and 1-Lipschitz in the usual sense. Now instead of dropping, say, a lower bound $\underline{r}_i$, we just set $\underline{r}_i = -\infty$ and the inequality $(\underline{r}_i \circ \widehat{\pi}_i)(x) \leq x_i$ means that no condition is imposed. The next proposition proves one of the two implications in Theorem 1.1.

3.3. **Proposition.** *For every $i \in I$ let $\underline{r}_i, \bar{r}_i \colon l_\infty(I \setminus \{i\}) \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be a pair of 1-Lipschitz functions such that $\underline{r}_i \leq \bar{r}_i$. Define*

$$Q := \{x \in l_\infty(I) : (\underline{r}_i \circ \widehat{\pi}_i)(x) \leq x_i \leq (\overline{r}_i \circ \widehat{\pi}_i)(x) \text{ for all } i \in I\}$$

and assume that this set is non-empty. Then Q is injective.

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{R}$ denote the set $\{\underline{r}_i : i \in I\} \cup \{\overline{r}_i : i \in I\}$. Let $\pi_i \colon l_\infty(I) \to \mathbb{R}$ be the i-th coordinate projection. We divide the proof into three steps.

First Step: We first show the statement in the case $\mathfrak{R}$ is a set of λ-Lipschitz functions for some $\lambda \in [0, 1)$ and F is a finite subset of I such that $\underline{r}_i = -\infty, \bar{r}_i = \infty$ for all $i \in I \setminus F$. Thus we only have a finite number of non-trivial inequalities. Assume without loss of generality that $F = \{1, \dots, N\}$. For $i \in F$ and any $x \in l_\infty(I)$, let us define $\varrho_i \in \mathrm{Lip}_1(l_\infty(I), l_\infty(I))$ implicitly through

$$\pi_j \circ \varrho_i(x) = \begin{cases} \min\big\{\max\{x_i, (\underline{r}_i \circ \widehat{\pi}_i)(x)\}, (\overline{r}_i \circ \widehat{\pi}_i)(x)\big\} & \text{if } j = i, \\ x_j & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Moreover, set $G_0 := \mathrm{id}_{l_\infty(I)}$, as well as

$$G_i := \varrho_i \circ \cdots \circ \varrho_1$$

and

$$T := G_N = \varrho_N \circ \cdots \circ \varrho_1.$$

Fix now $x \in l_\infty(I)$. We show that $(T^m(x))_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to a fixed point of T. Let us define the maps $\{f_i\}_{i \in F} \subset \mathrm{Lip}_\lambda(l_\infty(I), \mathbb{R})$ by

$$f_i \ : \ y \mapsto \min\big\{\max\{\alpha_i, (\underline{r}_i \circ \widehat{\pi}_i)(y)\}, (\overline{r}_i \circ \widehat{\pi}_i)(y)\big\},$$

where $\alpha_i := (\pi_i \circ G_{i-1} \circ T^m)(x) = (\pi_i \circ G_i \circ T^{m-1})(x)$. We further set

$$\beta_i := \Big|\pi_i\Big((G_i \circ T^m)(x) - T^m(x)\Big)\Big|$$

for any $i \in F$ and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i &= \Big|\pi_i\Big((G_i \circ T^m)(x) - (G_i \circ T^{m-1})(x)\Big)\Big| \\ &= \Big|\pi_i\Big((G_i \circ T^m)(x) - (\varrho_i \circ G_i \circ T^{m-1})(x)\Big)\Big| \\ &= \big|(f_i \circ G_{i-1} \circ T^m)(x) - (f_i \circ G_i \circ T^{m-1})(x)\big| \\ &\leq \lambda \big\|(G_{i-1} \circ T^m)(x) - (G_i \circ T^{m-1})(x)\big\| \\ &\leq \lambda \big\|(G_{i-1} \circ T^m)(x) - (G_{i-1} \circ T^{m-1})(x)\big\| \\ &\leq \lambda \big\|T^m(x) - T^{m-1}(x)\big\|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\left\|T^{m+1}(x)-T^m(x)\right\| \leq \max_{i\in F}\beta_i \leq \lambda\left\|T^m(x)-T^{m-1}(x)\right\|.$$

It easily follows that $(T^m(x))_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence and thus converging to a fixed point x^* of T. This implies in particular that $x^*\in Q$. Hence, we can define the 1-Lipschitz retraction $\varrho\colon l_\infty(I)\to Q$ to be the pointwise limit of the sequence $(T^m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$. It follows that Q is injective.

Second Step: We now prove the statement in case the functions in $\mathfrak{R}$ are only assumed to be 1-Lipschitz but keeping the assumption about the finite subset $F\subset I$. Moreover, we assume without loss of generality that $0\in Q$. By Lemma 3.2, it is enough to show that for any $R>0$, the set $Q\cap B(0,R)$ is injective. For each $i\in I$, we set

$$\begin{aligned}(\underline{s}_i\circ\widehat{\pi}_i)(x) &:= \min\{\max\{(\underline{r}_i\circ\widehat{\pi}_i)(x),-R\},R\}\\ (\overline{s}_i\circ\widehat{\pi}_i)(x) &:= \min\{\max\{(\overline{r}_i\circ\widehat{\pi}_i)(x),-R\},R\}.\end{aligned}$$

Using $0\in Q$, a short calculation yields that $\underline{r}_i\leq\overline{r}_i$ implies $-R\leq\underline{s}_i\leq\overline{s}_i\leq R$. Set

$$P:=\Big\{x\in B(0,R):(\underline{s}_i\circ\widehat{\pi}_i)(x)\leq x_i\leq(\overline{s}_i\circ\widehat{\pi}_i)(x)\text{ for all }i\in F\Big\}.$$

Since the functions $\underline{s}_i$ and $\overline{s}_i$ are 1-Lipschitz and using that $0\in Q$ again, one has

$$P=Q\cap B(0,R).$$

We can thus, for $k\in\mathbb{N}$ and $i\in F$, set $\lambda_k:=1-\frac{1}{k}$ and define $\underline{s}_i^k,\overline{s}_i^k$ through

$$\begin{aligned}(\underline{s}_i^k\circ\widehat{\pi}_i)(x) &= \lambda_k\big[(\underline{s}_i\circ\widehat{\pi}_i)(x)+R\big]-R,\\ (\overline{s}_i^k\circ\widehat{\pi}_i)(x) &= \lambda_k\big[(\overline{s}_i\circ\widehat{\pi}_i)(x)-R\big]+R.\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$-R\leq\underline{s}_i^k\leq\underline{s}_i\leq\overline{s}_i\leq\overline{s}_i^k\leq R.$$

For any $k\in\mathbb{N}$, we now set

$$Q_k:=\Big\{x\in B(0,R):(\underline{s}_i^k\circ\widehat{\pi}_i)(x)\leq x_i\leq(\overline{s}_i^k\circ\widehat{\pi}_i)(x)\text{ for all }i\in F\Big\}.$$

The functions in $\mathfrak{R}^k:=\{\underline{s}_i^k:i\in F\}\cup\{\overline{s}_i^k:i\in F\}$ are all λ_k-Lipschitz. Hence, we can apply the first step and define the 1-Lipschitz retraction $\varrho^k\colon B(0,R)\to Q_k$ to be the pointwise limit of the sequence $(T^{m,k})_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$. Since $B(0,R)$ is injective, it follows that Q_k is injective. Finally, since the sequence $(Q_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is decreasing for the inclusion and

$$\bigcap_{k\in\mathbb{N}}Q_k=P=Q\cap B(0,R),$$

it follows that $Q\cap B(0,R)$ is injective by Theorem 3.1. So

$$Q=\{x\in l_\infty(I):(\underline{r}_i\circ\widehat{\pi}_i)(x)\leq x_i\leq(\overline{r}_i\circ\widehat{\pi}_i)(x)\text{ for all }i\in F\}$$

is injective by Lemma 3.2.

Third Step: Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the family of all finite subsets of I. For every $F\in\mathcal{F}$, let

$$Q^F:=\{x\in l_\infty(I):(\underline{r}_i\circ\widehat{\pi}_i)(x)\leq x_i\leq(\overline{r}_i\circ\widehat{\pi}_i)(x)\text{ for all }i\in F\}.$$

As it is shown just above, Q^F is injective. Therefore, for every $R \in [0, \infty)$, the set $A^F := Q^F \cap B(0, R)$ is injective by Lemma 3.2. Let

$$\mathcal{M} := \big\{ J \subset I : A^{J \cup F} \text{ is injective for all } F \in \mathcal{F} \big\}$$

be partially ordered by inclusion. By the second step, $\emptyset \in \mathcal{M}$. Moreover, if $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and if $(J_\gamma)_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$ is a chain in $\mathcal{M}$, we can set $J_\Gamma := \bigcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} J_\gamma$ and we obtain by Theorem 3.1 that $A^{J_\Gamma \cup F} = \bigcap_{\gamma \in \Gamma} A^{J_\gamma \cup F}$ which is injective by Theorem 3.1. We can thus use Zorn's lemma to deduce the existence of a maximal element $M \in \mathcal{M}$. By maximality, it follows that $M = I$, which implies that the set

$$A^I = Q \cap B(0, R)$$

is injective as well. Again by Lemma 3.2, it follows that Q is injective and this concludes the proof. □

3.4. **Remark.** Let X and Y be metric spaces, and let $i \colon X \to Y$ be an isometric embedding. As stated in [6, (3) in Proposition 3.4], the following are equivalent:

(i) (i, Y) is an injective hull of X.
(ii) (i, Y) is a minimal injective extension of X, that is, Y is injective and no proper subspace of Y containing $i(X)$ is injective.

It follows that if X is an injective metric space, then $\mathrm{e}(X) = \mathrm{E}(X)$. In our case it follows that if $Q \subset l_\infty(I)$ is injective, then the distance functions $\{d_q\}_{q \in Q}$ are the only extremal functions in $\Delta(Q)$. Therefore, given any point $x \in l_\infty(I) \setminus Q$, the function $d_x \in \mathbb{R}^Q$ given by the assignement $q \mapsto \|x - q\|$ verifies $d_x(Q) \in (0, \infty)$, thus $d_x \notin \mathrm{e}(Q) = \mathrm{E}(Q)$, in other words $d_x \in \Delta(Q)$ is not extremal.

In the context of subsets of $l_\infty(I)$, we need to introduce some pieces of notation. Recall that $\pi_i \colon l_\infty(I) \to \mathbb{R}$ is the i-th coordinate projection. For $i \in I$, we set

$$C_i := \{x \in l_\infty(I) : x_i = \|x\|\}.$$

For $S \subset l_\infty(I)$, we define $-S := \{-s : s \in S\}$ and we write $p + S$ for the set $\{p + s : s \in S\}$, i.e. the translate of S by p. Note that the interior of C_i satisfies

$$\mathrm{Interior}(C_i) := \left\{ x \in l_\infty(I) : x_i > \sup_{j \in I \setminus \{i\}} |x_j| \right\}.$$

The next proposition is the last piece needed to prove Theorem 1.1.

3.5. **Proposition.** *If $Q \subset l_\infty(I)$ is injective, then Q satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 3.3.*

Proof. The injective subsets of $\mathbb{R}$ are exactly the closed intervals and the result clearly holds in this case. Therefore, assume that $|I| \geq 2$. By Remark 3.4, we may assign to every $x \in l_\infty(I) \setminus Q$ the positive quantity

$$\varepsilon(x) :=$$
$$\sup\{\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R} \,|\, \text{there is } p \in Q \text{ with } \|x - p\| + \|x - q\| \geq \|p - q\| + \varepsilon \text{ for all } q \in Q\}.$$

Choosing $q \in Q$ such that $\|x - q\| = d(x, Q)$, one can easily see that $\varepsilon(x) \leq 2d(x, Q)$. For every $x \in l_\infty(I) \setminus Q$, let $p_x \in Q$ be such that for every $q \in Q$, one has

$$\inf_{q \in Q} \Big(\|x - p_x\| + \|x - q\| - \|p_x - q\| \Big) \geq \tfrac{\varepsilon(x)}{2}.$$

Next we select a cone C_x for every $x \in l_\infty^n \setminus Q$. To that end, let α be some positive real parameter. We determine the value of α in the course of the proof. For any $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}\|x - p_x\|)$, one can find $i \in I$ such that

$$|\pi_i(x - p_x)| \geq \|x - p_x\| - \delta > 0.$$

(δ is the additional parameter needed to generalize from finite to infinite index sets I.) Now let $e^i \in l_\infty(I)$ be given by $e^i_j = \delta_{ij}$ i.e. e^i is everywhere equal to zero except at i where it is equal to one. We set

$$C_x := \begin{cases} x - \alpha\varepsilon(x)e^i + C_i & \text{if } \pi_i(x - p_x) > 0, \\ x + \alpha\varepsilon(x)e^i - C_i & \text{if } \pi_i(x - p_x) < 0. \end{cases}$$

Observe that $x \in \text{Interior}(C_x)$ holds for every x. Assume that we are in the case $C_x := x - \alpha\varepsilon(x)e^i + C_i$ (the case $C_x := x + \alpha\varepsilon(x)e^i - C_i$ is analogue). Assume that $Q \cap C_x \neq \emptyset$ and pick q in this intersection, one then has

$$w := q + \alpha\varepsilon(x)e^i \in C_x + \alpha\varepsilon(x)e^i = x + C_i.$$

Therefore $\|w - x\| = \pi_i(w - x)$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|w - p_x\| \geq |\pi_i(w - p_x)| = |\pi_i(w - x + x - p_x)| &= |\pi_i(w - x)| + |\pi_i(x - p_x)| \\ &\geq \|w - x\| + \|x - p_x\| - \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently

$$\|p_x - q\| \geq \|p_x - x\| + \|x - q\| - 2\alpha\varepsilon(x) - \delta.$$

Choosing $\alpha < \frac{1}{8}$ and $\delta < \frac{\varepsilon(x)}{4}$ we obtain a contradiction to the definition of p_x. Hence, we do so and obtain $Q \cap C_x = \emptyset$ for all $x \in l_\infty(I) \setminus Q$.

For every i, the function $\bar{r}_i$ is defined to be the pointwise infimum over the family of 1-Lipschitz functions $l_\infty(I \setminus \{i\}) \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by the assignement

$$y \mapsto \|\widehat{\pi}_i(x) - y\| + \pi_i(x) - \alpha\varepsilon(x)$$

where every x such that $C_x = x - \alpha\varepsilon(x)e^i + C_i$ contributes exactly one member. If there is no such x, we let $\bar{r}_i := \infty$. Similarly, $\underline{r}_i := -\infty$ if there is no x with $C_x = x + \alpha\varepsilon(x)e^i - C_i$ or otherwise the supremum over all functions

$$y \mapsto \|\widehat{\pi}_i(x) - y\| + \pi_i(x) + \alpha\varepsilon(x)$$

for x with $C_x = x + \alpha\varepsilon(x)e^i - C_i$. It is not difficult to deduce from $x \in \text{Interior}(C_x)$ and $Q \cap C_x = \emptyset$ that

$$Q = \{x \in l_\infty(I) : \underline{r}_i(\widehat{\pi}_i(x)) \leq x_i \leq \bar{r}_i(\widehat{\pi}_i(x)) \text{ for } i \in I\}.$$

It remains to be shown that the inequalities $\underline{r}_i \leq \bar{r}_i$ hold. First, note that if $\underline{r}_i(p) > \bar{r}_i(p)$ at some $p \in l_\infty(I \setminus \{i\})$, then there are points $x, y \in l_\infty(I) \setminus Q$ with $C_x := x - \alpha\varepsilon(x)e^i + C_i$ and $C_y := y + \alpha\varepsilon(y)e^i - C_i$ such that the intersection $\text{Interior}(C_x) \cap \text{Interior}(C_y)$ is non-empty. To show that this can not happen for appropriate choice of α, we assume that $\text{Interior}(C_x) \cap \text{Interior}(C_y) \neq \emptyset$ and start by noting that the apex $x - \alpha\varepsilon(x)e^i$ of C_x lies in $\text{Interior}(C_y)$. Therefore $x' := x - \alpha\varepsilon(x)e^i - \alpha\varepsilon(y)e^i$ lies in $\text{Interior}(y - C_i)$ and the same holds for $p'_x := p_x - \alpha\varepsilon(x)e^i - \alpha\varepsilon(y)e^i$ since $p_x \in x - C_i$.

So we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|x - p_x\| + \|x - p_y\| &\leq \|x' - p'_x\| + \|x' - p_y\| + \alpha(\varepsilon(x) + \varepsilon(y)) \\ &= \|p'_x - p_y\| + \alpha(\varepsilon(x) + \varepsilon(y)) \\ &\leq \|p_x - p_y\| + 2\alpha(\varepsilon(x) + \varepsilon(y)),\end{aligned}$$

hence by definition of p_x and p_y this leads to $\varepsilon(x) \leq 4\alpha(\varepsilon(x) + \varepsilon(y))$ and $\varepsilon(y) \leq 4\alpha(\varepsilon(x) + \varepsilon(y))$, respectively. Now take $\alpha < \frac{1}{8}$. The sum of the last two inequalities involving $\varepsilon(x)$ and $\varepsilon(y)$ then yields a contradiction. Therefore, $\mathrm{Interior}(C_x) \cap \mathrm{Interior}(C_y)$ is empty and this finishes the proof. □

4. Examples

We start with a remark.

4.1. **Remark.** Any codimension one linear subspace V of $l_\infty(I)$ is injective if and only if there is an $i \in I$ such that

$$V \subset l_\infty(I) \setminus (\mathrm{Interior}(-C_i) \cup \mathrm{Interior}(C_i)). \tag{4.1}$$

We first show that if V is injective, there exists a coordinate i as in (4.1). Assume that the converse holds, namely that for every $j \in I$, one can pick

$$v^j \in V \cap (\mathrm{Interior}(-C_j) \cup \mathrm{Interior}(C_j)),$$

Choose arbitrarily $p \in l_\infty(I)$ and assume without loss of generality that $v^j \in V \cap \mathrm{Interior}(C_j)$. Note that for any $\alpha \in [0, \infty)$, one has $\alpha v^j \in V \cap \mathrm{Interior}(C_j)$. Let $A(v^j) := |\pi_j(v^j)|$ and $B(v^j) := \sup_{i \in I \setminus \{j\}} |\pi_i(v^j)|$. Clearly, there is then an $\varepsilon \in [0, \infty)$ such that $A(v^j) \geq (1 + \varepsilon)B(v^j)$. A short calculation shows that putting $\alpha_j := \frac{2\|p\|}{\varepsilon B(v^j)}$, one obtains $A(\alpha_j v^j) - B(\alpha_j v^j) \geq 2\|p\|$. By choice of α_j, it then follows that

$$\begin{aligned}|\pi_j(p_j - \alpha_j v^j)| &= \|p_j - \alpha_j v^j\| \\ |\pi_j(p_j + \alpha_j v^j)| &= \|p_j + \alpha_j v^j\|.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, one infers that

$$\{p\} = \bigcap_{j \in I} \Big(B(\alpha_j v^j, \|p - \alpha_j v^j\|) \cap B(-\alpha_j v^j, \|p + \alpha_j v^j\|) \Big).$$

Picking $p \notin V$, it follows that V is not hyperconvex and thus not injective. This shows that if V is injective, such a coordinate as in (4.1) exists. Conversely, if such a coordinate i exists, then V can be expressed as

$$V = \Big\{ x \in l_\infty(I) : (\underline{r}_i \circ \widehat{\pi}_i)(x) \leq x_i \leq (\overline{r}_i \circ \widehat{\pi}_i)(x) \Big\} \tag{4.2}$$

where

$$(\underline{r}_i \circ \widehat{\pi}_i)(x) := \sup_{y \in l_\infty(I) \setminus V} (y_i - \|\widehat{\pi}_i(x) - \widehat{\pi}_i(y)\|)$$

and

$$(\overline{r}_i \circ \widehat{\pi}_i)(x) := \inf_{y \in l_\infty(I) \setminus V} (y_i + \|\widehat{\pi}_i(x) - \widehat{\pi}_i(y)\|).$$

It is easy to see by (4.1) that V is a subset of the right-hand side of (4.2). Now, we prove that the complement of V is contained in the complement of the right-hand side of (4.2). Consider the map $\pi_V^i : l_\infty(I) \to V$ which corresponds to the projection onto V along the i-th coordinate which is a well-defined map since i satisfies (4.2).

For any $y \notin V$, one either has $\pi_i(y) > \pi_i(\pi_V^i(y))$ which implies $\pi_i(y) > (\overline{r}_i \circ \widehat{\pi}_i)(y)$ or $\pi_i(y) < \pi_i(\pi_V^i(y))$ which implies $\pi_i(y) < (\underline{r}_i \circ \widehat{\pi}_i)(y)$. This proves the desired inclusion and thus that (4.2) holds. By Proposition 3.3, it follows that V is injective and this finishes the proof of the equivalence.

4.2. **Example.** In case $I := \mathbb{N}$ we consider the set $V := \ker(\Lambda)$ where $\Lambda\colon l_\infty(\mathbb{N}) \to \mathbb{R}$ denotes a real Banach limit, namely $\Lambda \in (l_\infty(\mathbb{N}))^*$ satisfies the following propeties

(1) Let $x := (x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence with non-negative terms, then $\Lambda(x) \geq 0$.
(2) If $S\colon l_\infty(\mathbb{N}) \to l_\infty(\mathbb{N})$ denotes the left-shift operator given by the relation $\pi_n \circ S = \pi_{n+1}$, one has $\Lambda \circ S = \Lambda$.
(3) For every convergent sequence $x := (x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, one has $\Lambda(x) = \lim_{n\to\infty} x_n$.

One can see that by invariance of the Banach limit under left-shift, V contains all sequences having only finitely many non-zero entries. It is then easy to see that there is no $i \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying (4.1) and thus V is not injective.

4.3. **Example.** In case $I := \mathbb{N}$ we can also consider the set $V := \ker(\Phi)$ where $\Phi\colon l_\infty(\mathbb{N}) \to \mathbb{R}$ denotes an element in $\alpha(l_1(\mathbb{N}))$ with $\alpha\colon l_1(\mathbb{N}) \to (l_\infty(\mathbb{N}))^*$ standing for the canonical isometric embedding induced by the one of $l_1(\mathbb{N})$ into its double dual. It is then easy to see that (4.1) holds if and only if $\|\alpha^{-1}(\Phi)\|_1 \leq 2\|\alpha^{-1}(\Phi)\|_\infty$, compare to [8, 9].

References

[1] N. Aronszajn, P. Panitchpakdi, Extension of uniformly continuous transformations and hyperconvex metric spaces, Pacific J. Math. 6 (1956), 405–439.
[2] J. B. Baillon Nonexpansive mappings and hyperconvex spaces Contemp. Math. 72 (1988), 11–19.
[3] D. Descombes A characterization of injective subsets in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with maximum norm, arXiv:1510.04181.
[4] Espínola, R., Khamsi, M.A.: Introduction to Hyperconvex Spaces. In: Kirk, W.A., Sims, B. (eds.) Handbook of Metric Fixed Point Theory, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht (2001)
[5] J. R. Isbell, Six theorems about injective metric spaces, Comment. Math. Helv. 39 (1964), 65–76.
[6] U. Lang, Injective hulls of certain discrete metric spaces and groups, J. Topol. Anal. 5 (2013), 297–331.
[7] B. Miesch, Gluing hyperconvex metric spaces. Anal. Geom. Metr. Spaces 3 (2015), 102–110.
[8] A. Moezzi, The Injective Hull of Hyperbolic Groups, Dissertation ETH Zurich, No. 18860, 2010.
[9] M. Pavón, Injective Convex Polyhedra. arXiv:1410.7306.

Department of Mathematics, ETH Zürich, 8092 Zürich, Switzerland
E-mail address: dominic.descombes@math.ethz.ch
E-mail address: mael.pavon@math.ethz.ch